



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/932,107	08/16/2001	Doug Rollins	500963.01	4153

27076 7590 10/12/2005

DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT
SUITE 3400
1420 FIFTH AVENUE
SEATTLE, WA 98101

EXAMINER

JOO, JOSHUA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2154

DATE MAILED: 10/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

09/932,107

Applicant(s)

ROLLINS, DOUG

Examiner

Joshua Joo

Art Unit

2154

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 16 September 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: _____.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: _____.

12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____

13. ☐ Other: _____.


JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Examiner will further clarify the rejection of claim 1 with the Banerjee reference, Patent #6,760, 017 (Banerjee hereinafter).

The operator interface data signals of claim 1 are considered as signals generated by the display, keyboard, or mouse (Col 11, lines 56-59; Col 42, lines 62-66; Col 43, lines 52. video/keyboard/mouse signal hereinafter.); and the operator interface connector of claim 1 is considered as the connection that allows the host computer to receive signals from the display, keyboard, or mouse (Col 42, lines 61-66; Col 43, lines 52-54.). Banerjee does not specifically mention of an operator interface connector, but a connector is inherent and must be present between the host computer and the display/keyboard/mouse for the host computer to be able to receive the video/keyboard/mouse signal. The system communication device is considered as the PCMCIA interface (Col 4, lines 7-10); and the operator interface transmission signals are considered as the signals that are transmitted from the host computer to the wireless interface device (Col 42, lines 61-66).

In claim 1, Applicant claims " a plurality of system communication devices, each system communications device being adapted to be coupled to the operator interface connector of a corresponding computer system...". Banerjee teaches of a host computer comprising a PCMCIA interface (Col 4, lines 9-12) and of receiving video/keyboard/mouse signals (Col 42, lines 61-66; Col 43, lines 49-55). Therefore, the system communication device (PCMCIA interface) is coupled to the operator interface connector (Connection for display, keyboard and mouse).

"...and operable in transmit mode to receive the operator interface data signals from the corresponding computer system through the operator interface connector of the corresponding computer system...". Banerjee teaches that the PCMCIA interface is used to transmit data from the host computer to the wireless interface device (Col 4, lines 8-13), and Banerjee also teaches that the wireless interface device receives "whatever is being displayed on the host computer" (Col 42, lines 61-66). Therefore, the wireless interface device is capable of receiving input from a mouse, a keyboard, and/or video transmitted from the host computer. Even though Banerjee has different intentions by teaching of disabling the host computer to prevent the transmission of the signals for the mouse and keyboard inputs as argued by the Applicant, Banerjee nonetheless teaches the above limitation. Since the PCMCIA interface is used to communicate with the wireless interface device, the PCMCIA interface is operable to receive video/keyboard/mouse signals (operator interface data signals). Once again, the operator interface connector is an inherent feature in Banerjee because the host computer is capable of receiving video/keyboard/mouse input.

".. and to generate corresponding operator interface transmission signals...". Banerjee teaches that the wireless interface device receives signals from the host computer (Col 42, lines 60-64). Therefore, the PCMCIA interface generates operator interface transmissions signal.

"... and operable in receive mode to receive operator interface transmission signals and to generate corresponding operator interface signals that are applied to the corresponding computer system through the operator interface connector of the corresponding computer system." Banerjee teaches of the host computer receiving signals from the wireless interface device (Col 6, lines 6-10; Col 11, lines 50-55). The received signals are processed as input data to the host computer to effect changes in the host computer (Col 11, lines 54-55. Operating system/ application). Therefore, the received signals are applied to the host computer.

Applicant argued that (1) The signals that are provided through the PCMCIA interface or ISA expansion slot are not the same as the operator interface data signals recited in claim 1; (2) the specific arrangement of Figure 3 provides certain advantages; and (3) Figure 2 of the Banerjee illustrates a network arrangement where the wireless interface device 100 is wirelessly connected to the host computer 101 through a network connected wireless access point 109, and not through the operator interface connectors, as recited in claim 1.

Examiner traverses the arguments:

As to point (1) The signals that are provided through the PCMCIA interface are considered by the Examiner as the operator interface transmission signals; and the operator interface data signals are considered as the signals generated by the display/keyboard/mouse of the host computer.

As to point (2), Applicant's argument that specific arrangements and embodiments are different and not taught by Banerjee are not specifically described in claim 1, therefore the claim is subject to different interpretation by the Examiner. It is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e. interface data signals comprising of keyboard, video, and mouse signals, wireless communications modules 314A-N are coupled through connectors through which keyboard, video, and mouse signals are provided, and lack of hardware.) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

As to point (3), Figure 2 is referring to a mode in which the wireless interface device is used with a wired LAN as Banerjee teaches "... the wireless interface device 100 can also be used with a wireless LAN in a peer-to-peer network or a wired LAN. In this mode, the transceiver 116 in the wireless interface device 100 communicates with an access point 109 by way of a transceiver..." (Col 4, lines 20-30). However, Figure 1 teaches of a host computer communicating with the wireless interface device without the wireless access point 109 in a stand-alone configuration (Col 4, lines 1-4). In Figure 1, the access point 109 is not needed because the wireless interface device is directly communicating with the host computer.